

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 352

CE 028 059

AUTHOR Hanberry, Gerald C.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation of the Community Education Program. Volume I--The Policy Report.
INSTITUTION Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Program Evaluation (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 12 Feb 81
CONTRACT 300-79-0704
NOTE 84p.; For related documents see CE 028 060, ED 159 459, and ED 176 027.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Agency Cooperation; *Agency Role; *Community Education; Coordination; Educational Cooperation; Educational Policy; *Federal Aid; Federal Programs; *Federal State Relationship; National Surveys; Policy; Policy Formation; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; School Districts; State Aid; *State Departments of Education; State Programs

ABSTRACT

A study analyzed the operations of state education agencies (SEAs) as they promote and develop the concept of community education (CE) in their respective states and assessed the impact of federal support on the capabilities of SEAs to develop their capacities in the community education area. Data were collected from 1001 respondents from the fifty states and the District of Columbia, which completed one of four evaluation instruments: an SEA activity questionnaire describing the resources and activities of state CE offices; interviews administered to SEA staff at thirty-eight sites; a training/technical assistance mail questionnaire assessing the content and usefulness of such assistance and the quantity and quality of interaction between SEAs and local community educators; and a local data-monitoring procedure form completed by directors of the thirty-seven federally funded local CE programs. (This policy report of the study concentrates on an overview of the study, the community education concept, the historical background of community education, and the evaluation design. A technical report of the study containing more extensive discussions of the study background, design, methodology, and findings is also available through ERIC--see note.) MN)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED198352

EVALUATION OF THE
COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM
VOLUME I - THE POLICY REPORT

Gerald C. Hanberry
George S. Wood, Jr.
Malcolm B. Young
Paul J. Hopstock
David A. Santellanes
Howard L. Fleischman

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Developed for the Office of Program Evaluation, Department of Education, pursuant to competitively awarded Contract No. 300-79-0704. Inclusive of associated reports and activities, the amount charged was \$175,976. The Government Project Officer was Mr. Edward Rattner. Development Associates' Project Director was Dr. Gerald C. Hanberry.

February 12, 1981

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

CE 028059

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Education. However, the opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department of Education should be inferred.

STUDY STAFF

The names of the persons employed or retained by Development Associates, Inc., with managerial or professional responsibility for this project and this report are listed below.

Officer-in-Charge:	Peter B. Davis
Project Director:	Gerald C. Hanberry
Senior CE Evaluation Advisor:	Malcolm B. Young
Senior Design and Analysis Specialists:	Howard L. Fleischman Paul J. Hopstock
Analysis Specialists:	Bruce E. Copping Milton R. Goldsamt Tania Romashko
Research Assistant:	Gary J. Grimsley
Field Staff:	Bart J. Givens Patricia A. Vasquez Barry D. Wardlaw

Senior CE Consultants:

Anthony J. DeLellis Assistant Professor Center for Public Affairs Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia	J. Keith Rogers Professor Rocky Mountain Center for CE Brigham Young University Provo, Utah
David A. Santellanes Director Northwest CE Development Center University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon	George S. Wood, Jr. Consultant Institute for CE Development Ball State University Muncie, Indiana

PREFACE

This study was conducted by Development Associates, Inc. (DA) for the Office of Program Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education. Pursuant to a competitive procurement, work began on the study in October 1979, most data were collected during spring and summer of 1980, and analyses were performed and the report written during the fall and winter of 1980. In commissioning the study, the Office of Program Evaluation implemented the annual evaluation mandate of the Community Education Advisory Council (CEAC). Together, they sought an evaluation of the role of State Education Agencies in developing community education throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

From the study's inception, the Community Education Advisory Council provided valuable guidance and support. A special evaluation liaison was assigned to coordinate activities with the study. The study project director met with the CEAC on several occasions as well as the evaluation committee to review plans, instrumentation and preliminary findings. CEAC's Chairperson, James Green, and the evaluation liaison, Donald Butler, were especially supportive throughout the study.

In addition, Development Associates acknowledges the invaluable assistance of Edward Rattner, Paul Messier and Robert Maroney of the Office of Program Evaluation; Ron Castaldi, Margaret Beavan, Sam Drew, Martha Methee, and Gene Wilhoit of the U.S. Department of Education Community Education Program and Bernard O'Hayre who served as the CEP's liaison with the study. Recognition should also be extended to the third-party evaluators employed by the SEA and LEA federal CE projects (see the appendix for a list of those evaluators).

Finally, the project director and the staff of this study wish to thank the community education coordinators in the 50 states and the District of Columbia for their extremely high degree of cooperation and help in conducting this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	iv
PART A. INTRODUCTION	
CHAPTER 1 STUDY OVERVIEW	1
A. The Community Education Concept	2
B. Historical Background	3
C. The SEA Role	5
D. Organization of the Report	7
CHAPTER 2 THE EVALUATION DESIGN	10
PART B. STATE EDUCATION AGENCY COMMUNITY EDUCATION SYSTEMS	
CHAPTER 3 DEVELOPMENT OF STATE COMMUNITY EDUCATION SYSTEMS	15
● How Do SEAs Develop Statewide Community Education Systems?	16
● What Are the Common Elements of SEA Community Education Systems?	19
● What Elements Appear to Be Most Closely Associated with Successful Development?	23
● What Changes in the Present Mode of CE System Development Would Facilitate More Local Development?	24
CHAPTER 4 STATE COMMITMENT ELEMENTS	25
● How Much Commitment for CE Is There in the States?	25
● To What Extent Have States Passed SEA Board Resolutions and Legislation Supporting CE?	26
● To What Extent Do SEAs Provide Financial Support to State and Local Programs?	27
● How Are the CE Offices Organized Within the SEA?	29
CHAPTER 5 SEA OPERATIONAL ELEMENTS	30
● What Processes and Policies Do SEAs Use For Assessing Needs and Planning Programs?	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
● How Are State Advisory Councils Used to Develop State CE Systems?	35
● Is the Use of Advisory Councils a Sufficient Way of Involving Citizens in State-Level Operations?	36
● How Do SEAs Facilitate Interagency Cooperation in the States?	37
● How Do SEAs Evaluate and Report on CE Activities?	39
● How Do State Commitment Elements Interact with SEA Operational Elements?	41
CHAPTER 6 DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL PROGRAMS	43
● How Effective Are SEAs in Developing Local Programs?	43
● Who Are the Recipients of T/TA?	45
● How Comprehensive is the Training and Technical Assistance Provided By the SEAs?	46
● What Means for Delivering T/TA Have Been Most Effective?	48
● How Do Local Development Elements Interact With State Commitment Elements?	50
PART C. NATIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT	
CHAPTER 7 FEDERAL STRATEGY	53
● How Has the Federal Funding Pattern Affected the Development of CE in the States?	54
● How Do SEAs Funded by the Federal Program Differ from Those States Not Funded, and How Do States Funded for Different Lengths of Time Differ from Each Other?	55
● To What Extent Have Federal Training and Technical Assistance (1) Been Useful to SEAs, (2) Demonstrated a Viable Federal T/TA Role, and (3) Addressed Important SEA Training Needs?	57
● Is a Federal-State-Local Partnership Operating, and in What Ways Has/Should the Federal Program Enhance Such a Partnership?	58
● Is There a Specific and Effective National Strategy Evident in the Interaction of the Federal Program and the Joint and Separate Actions of the SEAs?	58
● What is the Capacity of the States to Effectively Implement Formula Funding?	59

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 8 NATIONAL MONITORING AND REPORTING	61
• What Types and Levels of Information Would Be Useful at the Local, State and National Levels?	62
• How Can SEAs Overcome Certain Barriers to Gathering Information at the Local Level?	65
PART D. COMMUNITY EDUCATION: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT	
CHAPTER 9 RETROSPECT: RESULTS OF FOUR YEARS OF FEDERAL FUNDING	67
A. Introduction: 1978 Evaluation	67
B. 1980 Status	67
C. Summary and Conclusions	68
CHAPTER 10 PROSPECT: OBSERVATIONS ABOUT FUTURE COMMUNITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION	71

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Data Collection Instruments and Response Rate	11
2	States Selected for Site Visits and Mail Survey	12
3	Respondents for T/TA Mail Questionnaire	12
4	Community Education Development Index (CEDI)	19
5	State CEDI Scores and Number of State CE Elements	20
6	Distribution of Overall CEDI Scores	21
7	Percentage of States Scoring on Each Item By Total Score	23
8	Presence of State Commitment Elements in the State	26
9	Distribution of CEDI State Commitment Subscores	26
10	Local CE Program Funding Sources	28
11	Presence of SEA Operational Elements in the State	30
12	Distribution of CEDI SEA Operational Element Subscores	31
13	Content of State Plans	34
14	Roles of Advisory Councils in Decision-Making	35
15	Different Types of Cooperative Arrangements With State-Level Agencies	37
16	Presence of Local Development Elements in the States	44
17	Distribution of CEDI Local Development Element Subscores	45
18	Local Recipients of SEA Provided Training/Technical Assistance (T/TA)	46
19	Content Areas of Training/Technical Assistance	47
20	Usefulness of T/TA Strategies as Reported by Local Recipients	49
21	Levels of Information for Reporting	64

PART A

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1

STUDY OVERVIEW

The purpose of this national Evaluation of the Community Education Program was twofold: (1) To describe and analyze the operations of state education agencies (SEAs) as they promote and develop the concept of community education (CE) in their respective states; and (2) to assess the impact of federal support on the capabilities of SEAs to develop their capacities in the community education area. The focus on SEAs and state capacity-building is particularly appropriate at this time for several reasons. During recent years, the SEAs have been defining and assuming ever greater roles in community education. In many states, they represent the dominant leadership presence, although the configuration of leadership elements is still developing in most. The federal Community Education Program (CEP) in the U.S. Department of Education has placed heavy emphasis on state capacity-building through SEA development, thus supporting this emergence of SEA leadership. Further, the evaluation comes at the conclusion of a four-year federal funding cycle and the beginning of a new period of federal support. Thus, 1980 can be seen as a significant point at which to examine both the leadership of SEAs and the impact of the federal program as well as make recommendations to national and state policy makers in community education.

The general scope and focus of this evaluation was established by the Community Education Advisory Council (CEAC), which has a significant role in the community education policy-making process. The Council was first established by the Community Schools Act of 1974 and further sustained by the 1978 amendments to that Act.^{1/} Among the CEAC's major mandates is that of conducting evaluations of community education and reporting evaluation and other assessment results to the Secretary of Education and to the Congress. The report of this study, therefore, partially fulfills the Council's assessment and reporting responsibility as well as its leadership role in community education.

^{1/}Community Schools Act, 1974, (P.L. 93-380) and Community Schools and Comprehensive Community Education Act, 1978, (P.L. 95-561).

The conceptual framework for this evaluation was derived both from the philosophical and the programmatic background of community education.

A. THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION CONCEPT

Community education is an emerging, evolving concept. Central in its development seem to be several fundamental precepts with historical roots in American life and education. Among these precepts are the following:

- that learning for the individual is a lifelong process having both an academic dimension and a social dimension;
- that the effectiveness and relevance of learning is inevitably linked to individual experience and need;
- that the community setting and community resources are major factors influencing the potential for an individual's personal growth and development, and, therefore, should be important elements in the functioning of public education;
- that public education should be linked to individual growth and community development, both in the use of institutional resources and in determining educational goals and procedures;
- that a community's educational, social, and political systems are the servants of its citizens and therefore should include the citizenry in their decision-making processes; and
- that the ultimate goal of education is to improve the quality of life for the citizens of a community.

The contemporary origins of community education in practice can be traced back more than 40 years, years that have seen the concept evolve from one that was primarily programmatic, emphasizing the physical setting in which educational and recreational activities were carried out, to one whose emphasis is on the process used to implement community involvement activities. Community education, though, is still an elusive concept that defies standard definitions. In practice, the emphasis varies. To some, community education is a philosophical approach to education and the role of schools in society; to others it is a composite of relatively specific activities and programs; and to still others it is a process through which schools, other public institutions, and community residents mutually work to improve the quality of community life in the most cost-effective ways possible.

For purposes of operating a federal program supporting the implementation of the concept across the nation, the Community Schools Act in the 1978 Education Amendments defines community education as:

...a program in which a public building, including but not limited to a public elementary or secondary school or a community or junior college (or a related extension center), is used as a community center operated in conjunction with other groups in the community, community organizations, and local governmental agencies, to provide educational, recreational, health care, cultural, and other related community and human services for the community that the center serves in accordance with the needs, interests, and concerns of that community.^{2/}

B. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The philosophical roots of community education are found in the history of American educational, social, and political thought. Community education as a contemporary operational discipline or program, however, is generally seen as having begun in Flint, Michigan, by C. S. Mott and Frank Manley. They believed that schools could play a broad role in a community's life and they succeeded in "opening up the schools" for academic, recreational, and social purposes on a year-round, extended day basis. Since the beginning of their work in the mid-1930s, the development of "community school" programs, and more recently "community education" programs, around the nation has been nurtured primarily by the C. S. Mott Foundation through: (1) its philosophical leadership and its financial support for national visitation and training programs in Flint; (2) the development of a network of university centers to serve regional training and community assistance purposes; and (3) the use of "seed money" grants to encourage communities to develop community school/community education programs.

In addition to those efforts, local programs also sometimes arose in various areas of the country out of the interaction between individual communities which had implemented community education and neighboring communities which observed their successes and consequently adopted a similar program approach.

^{2/}Ibid.

2
Prior to the 1970s, leadership in developing community education outside of the C.S. Mott Foundation itself consisted almost entirely of educators who had participated in the Foundation internship program and who subsequently administered university centers or highly successful and visible local programs. In the late 1960s, this same leadership group spearheaded the formation of a national professional organization, the National Community Education Association.

As community education growth continued into the early 1970s, the movement toward state programs and capacity-building began in a few states through the formation of state associations, the funding of SEAs by the C.S. Mott Foundation, the self-generated interest of some SEAs and/or the SEA emphasis of some university centers.

The national community education picture changed significantly with the passage of the Community Schools Act in 1974, which established community education for the first time as a federal program. Under the Act, federal funds were made available on a competitive grant basis to SEAs and LEAs for planning, establishing, expanding, and operating community education programs. In addition, institutions of higher education could compete for funds to develop and deliver training in community education. The national attention and new funds that the federal program brought to community education also brought new people, new organizational interests, and new leadership forces. At the same time, an expanding cast of actors was evolving out of a natural growth in programs across the nation. As a consequence, pressures emerged for concept definition or redefinition, new leadership configurations, and changes in developmental strategies, particularly at national and state levels.

Any conceptual confusion about the community education concept which presently exists may be viewed as a result of the current period of growth and transition in the field. In fact, Development Associates, who conducted the first national evaluation of the Community Education Program in 1978, concluded that inherent in transforming an educational concept into a federal program is a period of defining program goals and developing operational guidelines.^{3/} Community education is

^{3/}An Evaluation of the Community Education Program, The Final Report, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

likely to continue to generate discord among its adherents as the field evolves and new participants help to further shape community education as a concept and as a practical program serving local citizen needs in communities across the country. The sensitivity of community education to changing societal needs and its flexibility further add to this evolutionary process.

Currently, the federal and state governments have assumed a leadership position in promoting and guiding the evolution of community education development and it is at the state level where some of the most significant changes in community education have been occurring. These changes were provided further impetus by the Education Amendments of 1978 which, in addition to reauthorizing the 1974 Community Schools Act, also encouraged the states to expand their role as leaders in community education.

C. THE SEA ROLE

At the time of Congressional action on community education in 1974, only nine of the states reported funding a community education position at the state level.^{4/} However, with the arrival of federal legislation, the number of funded positions at the state level jumped from 15 in 1975 to 33 in 1977. Currently, almost all 50 states and the District of Columbia have designated officials for community education activities. This sudden addition of "participants" in the community education movement has precipitated a period of "sorting out" of roles and redefinition of relationships by SEAs, involved institutions of higher education, and other national groups and organizations. (These recent developments have also resulted in the establishment of the National Council of State Education Agency Community Educators - NCSEACE).

In an effort to determine the appropriate role of SEAs in the implementation of community education, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) commissioned a study in 1977 of SEAs' concept of their existing and future roles in

^{4/}Migocki, David. "Prospectus for the Establishment of a Community Education Training Center at the University of Maryland" (unpublished paper presented to the Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education), Maryland State Department of Education; November, 1975, pp. 1-2 as cited in Community Education at the State Level. U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., (1976).

community education. Given new funding, new responsibilities, and a rash of requests for assistance from local education agencies (LEAs) and programs, there was an obvious need for states to clarify their role. The authors of that study stated that:

The justification for this study was based upon the need for coordinated planning in community education efforts that involved SEAs; the need to design appropriate state and federal legislation; and, the need to fill the relative void in empirical research related to the perceptions of Chief State School Officers regarding the roles of State Education Agencies in community education development.^{5/}

In that study, the provision of services to LEAs was ranked by the majority of Chief State School Officers as the primary role of the SEA at that time. This finding was confirmed in a subsequent study in 1979 by DeLellis and Semple in which the top-ranked strategy for providing services to LEAs was to ". . . train LEA staff and community members . . ." as well as to help LEAs form community groups interested in community education programs and activities.^{6/}

The 1977 study by Semple, DeLellis and Brown also reported what the Chief State School Officers perceived as desired future roles of SEA community education offices. In addition to the provision of technical assistance to local districts, CSSO's believed that the SEAs should focus on future statewide activities for community education development. According to the report, the areas of desirable future concentration included:

establishment of statewide Community Education Advisory Councils and goals; cooperative planning with other state agencies, and funding of a CE position at the SEA level . . . Of lesser priority was the need to provide general consulting workshops for local staff and/or community councils.^{7/}

^{5/}Semple, Barry F.; DeLellis, Anthony J.; and Brown, Jr., Fred; Community Education and State Education Agencies: An Assessment of Existing and Future Roles. Report No. 4, U.S. Government Printing Office, (1977), p.6.

^{6/}DeLellis, Anthony J., and Semple, Barry F.: Effective Strategies for State Education Agencies in Community Education Development. A National Assessment. The Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C. (1979), p.23.

^{7/}Op. Cit., p.26.

These areas of emphasis were again confirmed in their 1979 study as DeLellis and Semple found that:

the rankings of strategies pertaining to the establishment of statewide community education goals included identifying state-level agencies to participate, charging a SEA staff member with the responsibility for goal development, presentation of goals to the state board, forming a group to actually establish the goals, and the establishment of a process for goal development.^{8/}

It was against this backdrop of evolving leadership forces, continuing conceptual development, past study results, and the need for accurate evaluative information upon which to base present judgments and future strategies that this national evaluation study was designed and conducted.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

In an effort to accommodate the informational needs of the different audiences who may wish to make use of the evaluation outcomes, the results of this study are reported in two volumes.

Volume I - The Policy Report

Volume I, "The Policy Report," is organized into four distinct parts. There are two chapters in Part A which present an overview of the study, the community education concept, the historical development of community education, and the evaluation design.

Part B describes SEA community education systems, including state commitment to community education, SEA operational practices and approaches for local program development. In Chapter 3, a Community Education Development Index (CEDI), consisting of 12 major elements, describes those systems. Chapter 4 describes state commitment elements, including state policy, financial resources and staffing. Chapter 5 presents six operational elements used by SEAs, and Chapter 6 focuses on local development activities conducted by the SEAs.

^{8/}Op. Cit., p 23.

There are two chapters in Part C, which focus upon national CE development. Chapter 7 addresses the federal community education strategy, emphasizing state capacity-building, training and technical assistance, and formula funding for the states. Chapter 8 describes approaches to monitoring and reporting at the local, state and national levels.

Parts B and C, mentioned before, are organized around a series of questions central to the purposes of this study. The questions are presented and answered in such a way that the resulting discussion provides a summary of the findings as well as the study conclusions and recommendations. Overall conclusions and observations for the future appear in two chapters in Part D. Chapter 9 discusses the results of four years of federal funding. Chapter 10 provides an overview of the prospects for future development and evaluation in community education.

Volume II - The Technical Report

Volume II, "The Technical Report," includes more extensive discussions of the study background, design, and methodology, and presents all of the findings of the study. Findings, data tables, copies of various exhibits and instruments, examples of reporting forms, etc., are presented in detail in the seven-chapter report.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the study purpose and the community education concept. Chapter 2 presents a brief overview of the evaluation design, emphasizing overall data collection and analysis. A full description of the methodology is presented in Appendix E to Volume II. Chapter 3 describes the SEAs' broad historical development, goals and accomplishments. It also describes SEA community education development systems. Chapter 4 presents findings on state-level support for CE, emphasizing policies, legislation, organizational structures and staffing. Chapter 5 describes a variety of state CE office operations such as state plans, interagency cooperation and evaluation.

Chapter 6 describes SEA activities directed toward the development of local CE programs including training and technical assistance. Chapter 7 presents an overview of the 37 local CE projects funded by the federal CEP in 1979-80. In addition, the reporting form used to gather information on these projects is assessed.

Readers who wish only to review selected, issue-related findings and the conclusions and recommendations of the study should concentrate their attention on Volume I. Those who wish to review how the study was conducted or who wish to become familiar with the overall data collected in the study, to look for data in which they have a special interest, or to add a contextual dimension to the discussions in The Policy Report will want to read Volume II.

In the following chapter of Volume I, a brief overview of the evaluation design (Chapter 2) is presented.

CHAPTER 2

THE EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation design for this study consisted of four major components:

- SEA Activity Questionnaire completed by state CE coordinators in the 50 states and the District of Columbia describing the resources and activities of state CE offices;
- Site visits to 38 states consisting of interviews with the CE coordinator, three to five other members of the SEA staff, and four to six members of other state agencies related to CE;
- Training/Technical Assistance (T/TA) Mail Questionnaire sent to 700 local recipients of state-provided or sponsored training and technical assistance to assess the content and usefulness of that assistance and the quantity and quality of interaction between SEAs and local community educators; and
- Local Monitoring Data Procedure Form completed by the directors of the 37 federally funded local CE programs to test the usefulness of the form as a local performance report.

The major focus of the evaluation was on the activities and effectiveness of SEA community education offices in developing statewide CE systems. The SEA Activity Questionnaire, therefore, served as the most important source of information for the evaluation. Interviews with the CE coordinator, other SEA staff (i.e., immediate supervisor of CE coordinator; deputy superintendent; and directors of such programs as adult education, gifted and talented, Title I, arts, and humanities and vocational education), and staff of related state agencies (i.e., aging, community colleges, public health, parks and recreation in all states; and selected agencies such as higher education, social services, IHEs, etc.) served to provide qualitative details concerning the history, operations, and effectiveness of the SEA community education office. Responses to the T/TA Mail Questionnaire allowed independent verification of the usefulness of assistance provided to local community educators by the SEA community education office. A secondary focus of the evaluation concerned the nature and operations of federally-supported local CE programs, and the Local Monitoring Data Procedure Form was used to collect such data. A summary of the numbers and types of respondents for all data collection activities of the evaluation is presented in

Table 1, giving the expected and actual numbers of respondents as well as the actual percentage response rate.

Table 1
Data Collection Instruments and Response Rates

Data Collection Instrument	Respondents		
	Expected Number	Actual Number	Response Rate (%)
SEA Activity Questionnaire	51	51	100
SEA Process Interview Guide	39	38	97.4
Other SEA Staff Interview Guide	194	192	99.0
Cooperating Agency Interview Guide	217	201	92.6
T/TA Mail Questionnaire	700	492	70.3
Local Monitoring Data Procedure Form	37	37	100.0
Total Numbers	1,238	1,011	

Specific data collection techniques were designed and implemented for each of the four components. The SEA Activity Questionnaire was mailed to CE coordinators in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Coordinators in states which did not receive site visits were asked to return the questionnaire by mail. Coordinators in states which received visits were asked to complete the questionnaire, which was reviewed during the site visit itself. Visits were conducted to a total of 38 states. Third-party evaluators employed by SEAs visited 25 of the 27 states with a federally-funded CE project, and Development Associates' personnel visited 13 of the 24 states without federal funding in 1979-80 (see Table 2 for a list of the states).

A total of 700 questionnaires were mailed to individuals who had received training or technical assistance provided directly by or sponsored by the SEA community education office in the previous year. The population of possible respondents was identified through telephone interviews with state CE coordinators. The sample of respondents was selected from four categories of assistance: workshops provided directly by the SEA; other forms of assistance (excluding workshops) directly from the SEA; assistance sponsored by but not directly provided by the SEA; and assistance provided directly by the SEA and sponsored

but not provided by that office. A summary of the mail-out and response to the mail questionnaire is provided in Table 3.

Table 2
States Selected for Site Visits and Mail Survey

States with Federal CE Grant		States without Federal CE Grant	
Site Visits by Third-Party Evaluators		Site Visits by DA	Mail Survey Only
Alabama	New Hampshire	California	Delaware
Alaska	New Jersey	Connecticut	Georgia
Arizona	New York	District of Columbia	Hawaii
Arkansas	North Carolina	Maine	Illinois*
Colorado	Ohio	Mississippi	Louisiana
Florida	Oklahoma	Missouri	Maryland
Idaho	Oregon	Minnesota	Nebraska
Kentucky	Pennsylvania	Kansas	Nevada
Massachusetts	South Carolina	Rhode Island	New Mexico
Michigan	Utah	Texas	South Dakota
Montana	West Virginia	North Dakota	Tennessee*
	Wisconsin	Virginia	Vermont
		Wyoming	Washington

*Illinois and Tennessee had grants in 1979-80, but visits were not conducted.

Table 3
Respondents for T/TA Mail Questionnaire

	Workshop Recipients	Recipients of other forms of T/TA	CE office sponsored T/TA	Directly provided/sponsored T/TA	Total Recipients
Sampling Frame	2,019	1,020	984	143	4,166
Sample Mailed	330	165	160	45	700
Total Response	245	109	103	35	492
Usable Responses	231	103	98	35	467

Finally, directors of all 37 federally-funded local CE projects completed the Local Monitoring Data Procedure Form. Third-party evaluators working with those projects facilitated this data collection effort by: (1) distributing and explaining the use of the form; (2) reviewing the form for completeness and accuracy; and (3) submitting it for analysis.

The analytic approach was designed to maximize the usability and interpretability of the large quantity of information collected from a variety of sources. Frequency distributions on all variables were prepared, and percentages were calculated both including and excluding missing values. Multiple response categories were created for related items, and means, medians, and standard deviations were calculated for variables with appropriate numerical values. Relationships between nominal variables were examined through the use of cross-tabulations, while relationships between nominal and interval variables were examined by calculating mean values within nominal classes. Because most of the data collected came either from complete census information or from non-randomly selected respondents, sampling statistics were generally not employed. The major variables used in analytic breakdowns were: (1) presence/absence of a full-time coordinator; (2) presence/absence of a FY80 federal CE grant; (3) number of years of federal CE grants; and (4) population of state.

The aforementioned analytic approaches were utilized primarily in the preparation of the detailed analyses presented in Volume II. Those findings are summarized in the following chapters of this Policy Report. The findings, conclusions, and related recommendations were developed out of and structured around a series of questions critical to achieving the overall study objectives.

PART B

STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

COMMUNITY EDUCATION SYSTEMS

24

CHAPTER 3

DEVELOPMENT OF STATE COMMUNITY EDUCATION SYSTEMS

With the advent of the federal program came the emergence of the individual SEAs as units of leadership and program development on a nationwide basis. In particular, SEAs found themselves in a position to assume substantial responsibility for state leadership, capacity-building and service to local programs or communities. Almost half of the federal dollars was targeted to SEAs for such purposes. Individual SEAs responded in various ways to the opportunity but, in general, the result was that state-level strategies and SEA programs became the norm, rather than the exception.

Most state community education programs were initiated in the mid-1970s. Of the 38 SEA programs which were visited and surveyed during this study, two-thirds began their programs between 1974 and 1977, coinciding with the time of the federal initiative. Of the 38 surveyed, 36 (95%) had formally designated state-wide CE programs in 1980. Formal designation consisted variously of the appointment of a CE coordinator, the establishment of a CE office, the receipt of a federal grant, the approval of a state plan, or the passage of state legislation.

Since the 1970s has been a period of "state program development," and since much of the development was most active at the end of the decade, a review of the nature and progress of various individual program elements seemed insightful and useful in assessing the state programs. The extent and nature of community education programs within the 51 SEAs varies considerably in terms of state commitment to community education, certain structural features of CE offices, as well as in terms of specific operations and staff activities focused at the state and local levels. While state-level CE programs can be described in various ways, SEA programs can be seen as including various elements which can be used to describe commonalities and differences among the programs and to summarize the national assessment of community education development.

The primary purpose of this chapter will be to address the broad question: How Do SEAs Develop Statewide Community Education Systems? In addition, three related questions which represent important policy issues for federal and state programs will be discussed:

- What are the common elements of SEA community education systems/ programs?
- What elements appear to be most closely associated with successful development?
- What changes in the present mode of community education system development would facilitate more local development?

Each of these questions represents the level of inquiry pursued in this study and the type of conclusions to be reached. As previously described in Chapter 2, the subsequent summary of findings of the study, the conclusions reached and the recommendations offered were organized around these questions.

*How do SEAs Develop Statewide
Community Education Systems?*

In the broadest sense, SEAs' work toward the development of their respective statewide CE systems is based upon a fundamental assumption. That is, the ultimate aim/purpose of all SEA community education activity is to develop, support, assist and impact upon the development of community education in local communities. In achieving this purpose, SEA systems are characterized by state-level and local-level aspects. Thus, it is assumed that all statewide community education development ought to be directed ultimately toward developing, maintaining and improving local community education programs. With this fundamental purpose of SEA community education systems in mind, how do SEAs develop such systems? SEAs in the 50 states and the District of Columbia use three broad sets of processes to create their systems.

1. SEAs expand state-level commitment for community education development;
2. SEAs apply or translate their state commitment for community education into state-level program operations; and
3. SEAs develop and assist local community education programs.

Thus, a viable state CE system ought to be examined in the context of these three developmental processes. Each of these consists of several important elements which form the overall SEA community education system. Therefore, as shown below, there are 12 elements of a viable state system.

State Commitment

1. State policy supporting community education;
2. Financial resource base at state program level;
3. CE office/staff in the SEA;

SEA Operations

4. Needs assessment processes;
5. State plan for community education;
6. Citizen participation (advisory council);
7. Interagency cooperation within and outside the SEA;
8. Evaluation processes;
9. Monitoring and reporting system;

Local Development of Community Education

10. Information dissemination;
11. Training, technical assistance, and other support provided to local programs; and
12. Local community education programs existing in the state.

While these 12 elements are grounded in the practice and activities of the SEAs, all SEAs do not have all elements. In fact, one state has not yet developed any one of these elements and a few states have only several of the elements in place. Even so, almost all of the 12 elements exist in at least half of the states. The patterns of development and the extent to which certain or all of the elements were in place was a focus of this study. The descriptive question of what are the common elements of state community education systems became important. To answer this question, the Community Education Development Index (CEDI) was developed.

The first consideration in constructing the index was to decide on the relative importance of each of the 12 elements. Certain of the elements were particularly emphasized in the federal CE legislation and regulations, thus appearing to be more essential to state CE development than other elements. Therefore, six of the elements were double-weighted in comparison to the others. The result of the weighting procedure was to better equalize the importance of state commitment elements, SEA operational elements, and local development elements.

The next step in the process was deciding whether states should be judged on the elements on a simple "meets standard vs. does not meet standard" basis, or if more subtle distinctions between states should be made. The decision in most cases was to use relatively simple distinctions between states based on the presence or absence of expected activities/features. For those elements that were double-weighted, somewhat more complex standards were developed. Even so, these standards relied solely on the combined presence or absence of a variety of activities/features. In no cases were judgments of the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of activities used in constructing the index.

The resulting index consisted of an 18-item measure of community education development. The range of the scores on the index was from zero to 18, with a higher score representing greater development on the 12 elements. Each item was worth one point, and no partial points were used. One point apiece was given if the state had each of the 18 sub-elements (see Table 4).

It should be noted that the CEDI is simply one tool which can be used to judge state CE development. Items for the index were chosen by DA and do not represent either formally stated requirements or even predetermined goals for state offices. Arguments about appropriateness and weighting could be made concerning virtually all of the items. DA is, therefore, not willing to state that small differences on the CEDI represent meaningful differences in terms of state CE development. Despite these limitations, however, DA does believe that the results to follow provide a worthwhile context from which to describe CE development.

Table 4
Community Education Development Index (CEDI)

Element	Score/Points
State Commitment Elements	6
*1. State Policy Supporting Community Education	
• SEA board resolution concerning CE	1
• State legislation concerning CE	1
*2. Financial Resource Base	
• State funding for an SEA CE office	1
• State funding for local CE programs	1
*3. CE Office/Staff for CE	
• Designated state CE office	1
• A full-time CE coordinator	1
SEA Operational Elements	7
4. Needs Assessment Conducted	1
5. CE State Plan Developed	1
6. Statewide CE Advisory Council	1
*7. Interagency Cooperation with	
• One-three agencies	1
• Four or more agencies	1
8. Established Plan for Evaluating CE	1
9. Reporting System by Which Local Programs Describe Their Activities	1
Local Development Elements	5
*10. Information Dissemination by	
• One-four varied strategies	1
• Five or more strategies	1
*11. Training/Technical Assistance in	
• One-five content areas	1
• Six or more content areas	1
12. Presence of any Local CE Programs	1
Total	18

*Double-weighted elements.

*What Are the Common Elements of
SEA Community Education Systems?*

The distribution of states on the CEDI is presented in Table 5 with states rank ordered according to their total CEDI score (0-18). Summary statistics of the CEDI are also presented at the bottom of Table 6 which show the mean and

Table 5
STATE CEDI SCORES AND NUMBER OF STATE CE ELEMENTS

STATE	STATE COMMITMENT ELEMENTS						SEA OPERATIONAL ELEMENTS						LOCAL ELEMENTS						CED SCORE	
	STATE POLICY		FINANCIAL RESOURCE BASE		CE OFFICE AND STAFF		NEEDS ASSESSMENT	STATE PLAN	CITIZEN PARTICIPATION	INTERAGENCY COOPERATION	EVALUATION	REPORTING SYSTEM	INFORMATION DISSEMINATION	T/TA TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES		LOCAL CE PROGRAMS				
	SEA Board Resolution	State Legislation	STATE FUNDING FOR...		Designated CE Office	Full-Time Coordinator	Conducted for CE	Draft or Approved	Presence of Advisory Council	1-3 Agencies	4 or More Agencies	Strategy in Use	Used by SEA	Using 1-4 Strategies	Using 5 or More Strategies	1-5 Content Areas	6 or More Content Areas	Programs Presented in States		Number of Programs
			SEA CE Office	Local CE Programs																
1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	36	18
2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	118	18
3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	30	18
4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	230	18
5	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	150	17
6		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	50	17
7	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	10	17
8	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	80	17
9		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	285	17
10	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	50	17
11		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	329	16
12	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	42	16
13	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	36	16
14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	8	16
15		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	21	16
16	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	16	15
17	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	70	15
18	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	19	15
19	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	242	15
20			x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	30	14
21			x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	35	14
22	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	11	14
23			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	40	13
24			x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	29	13
25	x	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	15	13
26		x		x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	75	13
27	x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	17	13
28	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	171	13
29		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	85	13
30					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9	13
31		x			x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	x	29	12
32		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	50	12
33	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	8	12
34		x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	18	12
35	x				x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	10	12
36			x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	35	12
37		x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	207	11
38				x	x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	82	11
39		x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	65	11
40							x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9	11
41			x		x			x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	16	10
42			x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x			x	0	9
43	x	x			x				x	x	x			x	x	x		x	8	9
44			x		x				x	x		x						x	20	8
45	x		x		x				x	x				x	x	x		x	6	8
46	x						x	x	x	x				x				x	18	7
47							x	x		x	x	x		x			x	x	0	6
48		x			x									x		x		x	10	5
49	x	x												x				x	30	4
50																		x	3	1
51																			0	0
TOTAL	25	25	35	22	45	34	41	26	35	46	38	29	24	49	37	44	37	48	2963	

* States are listed in rank order from 0-18, with no particular sequence for states with the same score.

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

median scores of 12.6, and 13.0, respectively. About 22% or 11 of the states received a CEDI score of ten or below with only four states with a five, four, one, and zero, respectively. At the high end of the scoring scale, ten states received either a 17 (six states) or 18 (four states). Regardless of one's standards, there appears to have been a good deal of development of CE in the 51 SEAs.

Table 6
Distribution of Overall CEDI Scores

Score	States	
	Number	Percent
0	1	2
1	1	2
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	1	2
5	1	2
6	1	2
7	1	2
8	2	4
9	2	4
10	1	2
11	4	8
12	6	12
13	8	16
14	3	6
15	4	8
16	5	10
17	6	12
18	4	8
Total	51	100
Mean = 12.6		Median = 13

*Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding

In examining the extent of development of the elements across all states, only two elements existed in less than half of the states: State funding for local programs (22) and reporting system used by SEAs (24). Overall, and using the mean score for each of the three sets of elements, the local development elements (see Chapter 7 for details) were more common to all states than the other elements. For instance:

- In information dissemination, 49 SEAs used one to four varied strategies and 37 used five or more strategies;

- In training/technical assistance, 44 SEAs offered T/TA in one to five areas and 37 of those SEAs offered T/TA in six or more areas; and
- 48 of the SEAs had (or reported) the presence of some local CE programs.

The presence and development of state commitment (see Chapter 5) and state operational elements, varied across the elements and the 51 SEAs. For example, 25 SEAs received one point for SEA board resolutions and 25 SEAs received one point for having state CE legislation on the CEDI. However, only 12 states had both components of that policy element. Thus, 13 states did not have any form of state policy support.

There was, on the other hand, somewhat greater consistency in the CE office/staff element. That is, 45 SEAs had an office designated (note that all 51 SEAs had at least a part-time person responsible for some community education activity) for community education and 34 (67% of all SEAs and 76% of those with an office) had full-time CE coordinators.

Of the SEA operational elements, interagency cooperation (46 SEAs) was (see Chapter 6 for details) the most common element across all 51 SEAs and the use of a reporting system was the least common (24 SEAs). The others are listed below in the order of the most common to the least common:

- Interagency cooperation (46);
- Needs assessments (41);
- Advisory councils present (35);
- Evaluation processes used (29);
- State plan developed (26); and
- Reporting system used by SEA (24).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the presence or absence of a particular element or set of elements in a given state should not be construed as an indicator of an effective system. Yet this question of which elements can or appear to be associated with success is important and will be addressed next.

*What Elements Appear to be Most
Closely Associated with Successful
Development?*

In order to describe various levels of CE development within states, three categories of states were constructed based on their CEDI scores. States were described as having high, medium or low levels of development based on CEDI scores in the ranges from 15-18, 12-14, and 0-11. These three categories of states were then examined separately to determine the elements which most clearly distinguished states with high scores from those with low scores. The results of that analysis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7
Percentage of States Scoring On Each Item By Total Score

Element	High 15-18 (N = 19)	Medium 12-14 (N = 17)	Low 0-11 (N = 15)
1. SEA Board Resolution	79	35	27*
2. State Legislation	68	41	33
3. State Funding for SEA Office	100	65	33*
4. State Funding for Local Programs	79	35	7*
5. Designated CE Office	100	100	60
6. Full-Time Coordinator	95	82	13*
7. Needs Assessment	95	88	53
8. State Plan	79	29	40
9. Advisory Council	95	65	27*
10. Cooperation, 1-3 Agencies	100	100	67
11. Cooperation, 4 or More Agencies	95	76	47
12. Evaluation Process	95	53	33*
13. Reporting System	95	29	7*
14. Dissemination, 1-4 Strategies	100	100	87
15. Dissemination, 5 or More Strategies	89	71	47
16. T/TA, 1-5 Content Areas	100	100	53
17. T/TA, 6 or More Content Areas	89	100	20*
18. Local CE Programs	100	100	80

*Difference in % between high and low = 50% or more

It should be noted that highly developed states received higher scores than states with low levels of development for all CEDI items. Table 7 also shows that there are eight items on which there were large differences between states with high and low CEDI scores. States with high scores were much more likely than those with low scores to have: (1) an SEA board resolution; (2) state funding for an SEA CE office; (3) state funding for local CE programs; (4) a full-time coordinator; (5) an advisory council; (6) an evaluation strategy in

use; (7) a reporting system for local programs; and (8) T/TA provided in six or more content areas.

These eight elements, therefore, are particularly likely to appear in highly developed programs, but not to appear in programs with lower levels of development. Thus, these elements appear to be key indicators of the level of development within states.

*What Changes in the Present Mode
of Community Education System
Development Would Facilitate
More Local Development?*

States with a full-time equivalent staff of 1.4 or more were much more likely to have in place a needs assessment strategy, a state advisory council and provide training and technical assistance to local programs. Increased SEA funding for the community education coordinator's position in addition to funding support for the operation of the office itself seems, therefore, appropriate in some states.

States with the presence of state funding legislation were more likely to have a higher number of local programs. It may be reasonable to conclude that such local programs spread around a state might serve as useful models for neighboring communities. It is, therefore, recommended that there be an expansion of support for and emphasis on state operational elements.

More effective use of interagency cooperation at the state level for state commitment impact and for facilitating the sharing of local resources would be advisable.

CHAPTER 4

STATE COMMITMENT ELEMENTS

This chapter focuses on a fundamentally important component of state community education development: State commitment for community education. The overriding question to be addressed is:

*How Much Commitment for CE
Is There in the States?*

The extent of commitment is an important indicator of the long-term development and institutionalization of the CE concept. As defined by the CE Development Index (CEDI), state commitment has three elements:

- State policy supporting CE;
- Financial resource base at the state program level; and
- CE office and staff in the SEA.

The number and percent of states which had addressed these elements and their subparts are shown in Table 8. The type of commitment most frequently found among the states was the designation of a CE office within the SEA. In addition, state funding for the SEA community education office and the presence of a full-time CE coordinator were found in over two-thirds of the states. On the other hand, less than one-half of the states provided state funding for local CE programs.

The distribution of CEDI state commitment scores is shown in Table 9. Overall, 18 states (35%) had addressed at least five of the six sub-elements, while 11 states (22%) had addressed two or less. Qualitative data were not gathered to evaluate the perceived impact or effectiveness of these elements on the development of community education. There seems to be, however, wide variability among the states in terms of their commitment, with approximately one-third of the states showing significant commitment and the other two-thirds reporting moderate to very little commitment, particularly as defined by this index.

Table 8

Presence of State Commitment Elements in the States

CEDI State Commitment Elements	Number of States	Percent of States
State Policy:		
SEA board resolution	25	49
State legislation	25	49
Financial Resource Base:		
State funding for SEA CE office	35	69
State funding for local CE programs	22	43
CE Office and Staff:		
Designated CE office	45	88
Full-time coordinator	34	67

Table 9

Distribution of CEDI State Commitment Subscores

Subscore	States	
	Number	Percent*
6	8	16
5	10	20
4	10	20
3	12	24
2	6	12
1	1	2
0	4	8
Total	51	100%
Mean = 3.6	Median = 4	

*Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding

With this general discussion in mind three specific questions relative to state commitment will be briefly addressed in the remainder of this chapter.

*To What Extent Have States Passed
SEA Board Resolutions and Legisla-
tion Supporting CE?*

A formal state board of education resolution supporting community education had been passed by 25 states and an SEA position paper supportive of CE had been developed by 22 SEAs. Of these states, 12 had both a board of education resolu-

tion and an SEA position paper supportive of CE. On the other hand, 16 states had not supported CE through either a board of education resolution or SEA position paper. These figures preclude states where either a board resolution and/or SEA position paper were being developed during this evaluation's data-gathering process.

A total of 25 states had state legislation supporting CE. However, in only 11 of these 25 did the legislation include funding for local programs. The other 14 states had only permissive legislation which allowed local programs to expend monies for activities that might be defined as CE. Ten other states provided funding for local programs through means other than state legislation. The 26 remaining SEAs had no state legislation relative to community education. Thus, more states had designated CE programs than had CE state legislation (see Table 5 for number of local programs in each state). It can be concluded that some state CE programs consisted only of efforts supported by the federal CEP funded grants and very limited SEA budget support.

Most initial legislation for CE was passed between 1973 and 1978. Most recent legislation was passed between 1976 and 1979. Twelve states reported that legislation was currently being planned and/or developed. Of these, five states reported that legislation had been drafted and was before a committee; three states reported that legislation had been drafted and was under review; and four states reported that legislation was currently being drafted. It was apparent that states viewed state legislation as a useful strategy for developing community education programs, as well as for a strategy for mobilizing financial resources.

*To What Extent Do SEAs Provide
Financial Support to State and
Local Programs?*

The CE programs operating in the SEAs received their financial support from four different sources: the SEA, other state agencies, private foundations, and the Federal government. A significant number (35) of the state CE programs received funding from the SEA in 1979-80; 27 of the state CE programs received federal CE grants and two SEAs had extensions of previous federal grants for a

total of 29; and 21, almost half, received private foundation funds. A small number of programs received funding from other state agencies, other federal grants, and from miscellaneous sources in 1979. From those sources, the state CE coordinator's position was mostly supported by state funds: 47% from state funds; 38% from federal funds; 10% by a combination of state and federal; and 5% by private foundation monies.

Local projects, on the other hand, received funding from many sources. Table 10 shows the number of projects by funding source. In reading this table, it should be remembered that any one project may have had more than one source of funding. Of the 2,963 local projects reported by SEAs, 84% received LEA funding, 65% received tuition and fees paid by participants, and 53% received SEA funding. Of the 21 states providing SEA funding to local projects, five states used a competitive funding process, 4 states used funding based on the general education allocation, and three states used formula grants based on population. The remaining states used other funding processes.

Table 10
Local CE Program Funding Sources

(N=2,963)

Source of Funding	Local CE Programs	
	Number	Percent*
1. Federal CE Grant	37	1
2. SEA Funds	1,556	53
3. LEA Funds	2,502	84
4. Other Federal Agency	363	12
5. Local Government	265	9
6. Business/Industry	101	3
7. Private Foundation	137	5
8. Other	1,935	65

*Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple response

Although only 21 states provided funding for local CE programs, 35 provided state-funding for CE office activities in the 1979-80 program year.

How Are the CE Offices Organized Within the SEA?

Community education programs were administered within state education agencies most often by the adult education divisions. In one state, the program was placed outside of the SEA and administered by a state university. Most state CE programs had one professional (the CE coordinator) and one clerical staff. A total of 34 states had full-time CE coordinators, while the others had part-time coordinators who spent, on the average, 20% of their time on CE. In most states the head of the CE program was given the title of coordinator or director; in some states, however, the lower level position of consultant or specialist was held. About three-fourths of the CE program administrators reported to a unit director, chief, or coordinator; the other one-fourth reported to a higher level, either an assistant, associate, or deputy superintendent. It should be noted that the relative effectiveness of one organizational scheme versus another (where the CE coordinator was placed in the organizational structure of the SEA) was not a focus of this evaluation.

CHAPTER 5

SEA OPERATIONAL ELEMENTS

As described in Chapter 3, there were six CEDI elements which provided evidence concerning state development in the area of SEA operations and activities. A summary of those elements and their CEDI scores are presented in Table 11.

Table 11
Presence of SEA Operational Elements in the States

Operational Elements	States	
	Number	Percent
Needs Assessment	41	80
State Plan	26	51
Citizen Participation (Advisory Council)	35	69
Interagency Cooperation with		
-- 1-3 agencies	46	90
-- 4 or more agencies	38	75
Evaluation Processes	29	57
Reporting System	24	47

Interagency cooperation and needs assessment were clearly the two areas in which the most activity had taken place. The presence of a statewide reporting system was the least frequently present element.

The distribution of states based on their CEDI subscore for these seven items is presented in Table 12. Somewhat less than half of the states (45%) received scores of either six or seven on this subscale, while an additional third (33%) scored either four or five. The level of development of SEA operational elements could be described as moderate, with additional emphasis clearly advisable in the areas of reporting, planning, evaluation, and citizen participation.

Table 12
Distribution of CEDI SEA Operational Element Subscores

Subscore (0 - 7)	States	
	Number	Percent*
7	12	24
6	11	22
5	6	12
4	11	22
3	5	10
2	1	2
1	1	2
0	4	8
Total	51	100
Mean = 4.7	Median = 5	

*Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding

Moreover, as revealed in the response to the following question on needs assessment, additional development is recommended for expanding the participants in and processes used in conducting needs assessments.

<i>What Processes and Policies Do SEAs Use for Assessing Needs and Planning Programs?</i>

One of the fundamental elements in a program planning process is the assessment of needs, problems and conditions within the state. Needs assessment is important because it is usually necessary and useful to establish that a widespread need for the proposed program exists, and it may be even more useful in setting goals, targeting resources and creating activities which meet the needs of the identified target group. Therefore, needs assessment is considered to be conceptually and practically an important part of the overall program planning/development process. Evaluation is also thought of as part of that process. However, these three elements were surveyed separately and will be discussed that way.

Needs Assessment

At first glance, it appears that SEAs have made extensive use of needs assessments in planning or maintaining their programs. That is, about 80% (41 SEAs) conducted an informal or formal needs assessment during the past year. While 41 SEAs conducted a needs assessment, 12 (30%) of them received a CEDI score on operational elements of four or less. In fact, one SEA with an overall CEDI score of 8 had only the operational element of needs assessment in place. Those states with low CEDI subscores for operational elements tended not to include needs assessment whereas they were more likely to have some degree of interagency cooperation in use.

What are SEA policies for conducting needs assessment? Who conducts the assessments? One-third of the 41 SEAs that conducted needs assessment used only the staff of the CE office in implementing the assessment. Of the remaining 28 SEAs, most involved only a few other agencies and only two included citizens-at-large. Institutions of higher education (IHE) were involved directly with SEAs in 13 states. It should be noted that an IHE community education development center exists in or is available to all 51 SEAs. The other groups of participants involved to any degree were state CE advisory councils (10 SEAs), other SEA personnel (10 SEAs) and state CE associations (11 SEAs).

Generally, it appears that SEA policies for conducting needs assessment required that the implementation be a professional community education staff function. However, this approach may have been a decision of the CE staff in the SEA. It is not possible here to describe whether that policy or approach is effective or not. It certainly does not provide the basis for a comprehensive approach to needs assessment.

It appears that comprehensiveness in approach and in involvement of representatives of agencies and citizens was gained by most of the SEAs through the information-gathering process. In general, the SEAs collected information about local needs for training and technical assistance and state-level training resources. About two-thirds of the SEAs gathered information from such groups as: Local community education personnel (29), cooperative state agencies (38), state CE associations (25), state CE advisory councils (24), IHE centers (24),

and local agencies (24). This is in contrast to the low level of involvement of such groups in conducting needs assessment. This finding was also supported by the interviews with the representatives of 201 cooperating agencies in the 38 site-visit states. About one-fourth of them reported being involved in conducting needs assessment and over half indicated that they had provided information, mostly of a general nature.

State Planning

Typically, in federal and state government supported programs, a state plan is intended to be a concrete result of needs assessment and statewide planning activities. In the case of the 1978 federal community education legislation, a state plan is called for (Section 808) "any State desiring to participate in the program". The SEA would be expected to submit the state plan through its state educational agency to the CEP. Given this federal requirement and the potential for the CE legislation, the status of and eventual appropriation for the 1978 CE legislation, the status of and approaches to state plans by SEAs were explored. It was found that a state plan was developed in 26 SEAs throughout the U.S. Only one state had a state plan without the benefit of a needs assessment. Eight of those 26 states had an approved (officially approved by the State Board of Education, the Chief State School Officer) state plan and the other 18 plans were developed but not approved (using their own definitions for what constitutes approval).

What effect has federal funding (see Chapter 7 for further details) had on the development of state plans? It does not appear that the receipt of federal CE funding had a significant impact on the development of state plans (eight of the 16 states funded for four years had a plan and eight did not). The SEAs funded in 1979 were slightly more likely to have a state plan (15 vs. 11). Also, four of the nine SEAs never receiving a federal CE grant in the four years of federal support for CE had a state plan. Several states had developed or were developing state plans in anticipation of the activation of the formula funding program authorized in the previously mentioned 1978 amendments for CE.

Since it appeared that state plans might eventually be required, the content of state plans was examined. A possible outline was derived from the CE literature and sample state plans and the SEA coordinators were asked to indicate whether particular items were included in their state plan. Table 13 shows the

number and percentage of states which had included specific items in their plan. A statement of philosophy and objectives were the most frequently included parts of the state plan, while funding plans and roles of cooperating agencies were the least often included elements.

Table 13

Content of State Plans

(N=26)

Elements	Number	Percent*
1. Statement of Philosophy	25	96
2. Statement of Objectives	24	92
3. Definition of Terms	21	81
4. Implementation Guidelines for State Plan	20	77
5. Training and Staff Development Plans	19	73
6. Means of Evaluation of State Program	19	73
7. Means for Assessing Needs	18	69
8. Program Goals for 1-3 Years	18	69
9. Funding Plans and Projections	16	62
10. Role and Relationships of Cooperating Agencies	16	62

*Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple responses

It is interesting that while 41 SEAs reported they had conducted needs assessments, only 18 SEAs included a provision for assessing needs in their state plan. This might be an indication of the quality of effort and approach to relating the assessment of needs to the development of plans.

SEA community education offices involved a variety of other agencies and groups in the development and dissemination of their state plans. Comparatively, SEAs had more comprehensive involvement of other agencies, particularly IHEs, state CE associations, state advisory councils and other SEA officials in the development of the state plan than in the conduct of needs assessments. Citizens-at-large, local CE project staff and local CE councils were represented in about half of the states. However, the state plans were not widely distributed within the states. Only 58 or 34% of the 170 cooperating agency representatives contacted about state plans reported receiving a copy of the state plan.

*How Are State Advisory Councils Used
to Develop State CE Systems?*

There were 34 state advisory councils concerned with community education, 27 of them devoted entirely to community education. On the average, the councils had been in existence for 3 1/2 years and met between three and four times per year. The mean number of members on each council was 22, with the number ranging from a very small council of five to a rather large council of 60. Advisory council members represented a wide variety of state and community groups in those 34 states: General public (34), parks and recreation (30), local community education personnel (29), community colleges (29), human and social services (27), department of aging (22), other SEA personnel (19) and public health (12). For the most part, individuals were suggested for membership by SEA community education personnel and appointed by the Chief State School Officer.

The principal role of the advisory council was in advising in state CE policy. This was reported by CE coordinators to be the council's role in 25, or 74%, of the states with councils. Sharing in decision-making was found to be a role in only five, or 15%, of the states (see Table 14). Interestingly, only one state reported that its council made major decisions concerning community education policy.

Table 14
Roles of Advisory Councils in Decision-Making

Role	States	
	Number	Percent*
Advises in State CE Policy	25	74
Shares in Making Major Decisions	5	15
Provides Support for Decisions Made by the State CE Office	2	6
Makes Major Decisions Concerning CE Policy	1	3
Other	1	3
Total	34	100

*Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding

The two areas of responsibility which concerned most state advisory councils during the 1979-80 program year were promoting interagency cooperation at the state level and developing a state plan. These two areas were reported as areas of responsibility by 29 (85%) and 28 (82%), respectively, of their state advisory councils. Additionally, developing state guidelines for local CE projects was reported by 14, or 41%, of the states with councils.

*Is the Use of Advisory Councils a Sufficient Way of
Involving Citizens in State-Level Operations?*

While all 34 SEAs with an advisory council reported involving the general public as members of their councils, most of their membership consisted of agency representatives and some local community education professionals. In addition to this rather limited representation of the general public or "unaffiliated citizens" on advisory councils, there were other indications that, while it was important to involve citizens on the advisory council, it was not necessarily a sufficient (certainly not the only one) means of accomplishing that purpose. Other potential indicators were:

- 26 SEAs developed a volunteer corps of CE workers;
- 23 SEAs gathered information from citizens for assessing needs;
- 15 SEAs included citizens in the development of their state plans;
- 2 SEAs involved citizens-at-large in conducting needs assessment;
and
- Over 5,000, or about 30%, of all the recipients of training and technical assistance given by the SEAs were community residents/citizens.

It seems, therefore, appropriate to suggest that SEAs explore alternative ways of involving citizens in state-level activities.

*How Do SEAs Facilitate Interagency
Cooperation in the States?*

Based on previous discussions of the major role of agencies -- within the SEA and outside the SEA -- in various SEA operations, it was evident that the primary way that SEAs manage agency cooperation was through advisory councils. As shown in Table 15, over 70% of the arrangements for interagency cooperation were in the area of joint participation on councils. While the approach to interagency cooperation is rather narrow in focus, the overall level of SEA reported involvement with other agencies was fairly high. For instance, in the 38 states visited, over 90% of the 201 cooperating agencies and 192 other SEA personnel interviewed indicated some contact with the SEA community education office. Further, it was found that 87% and 84% of those two groups, respectively, had some to a great deal of awareness of the activities of that office.

Table 15

Different Types of Cooperative Arrangements with State-Level Agencies

Cooperative Arrangements	Cooperating Agencies (N = 172)		CE Coordinators (N = 51)	
	Number	Percent*	Number	Percent*
Participation on Interagency Councils or Committees	122	71	34	67
Mutual Participation in Program Development Activities	111	65	29	57
Share Facilities, Equipment	80	47	15	29
Joint Review of Funding Proposals	57	33	19	37
Joint Funding of Activities	50	29	15	29
Policies for Mutual Referral of Clients	43	25	17	33

*Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple responses

A total of 172 cooperating agency representatives reported some relationship with the state community education office:

- 19% had formally defined relationships;
- 33% had informal but defined relationships;
- 41% had informal and exploratory relationships; and
- 7% had relationships which were different in some way from the three above.

When the cooperating agency staff were asked about the usefulness of these relationships, over 93% reported these were useful or very useful in every case. Similarly, over 90% of the CE coordinators rated these arrangements as useful or very useful. These arrangements appeared to indicate usefulness to local community education programs as well. Cooperating agency officials were asked about the support provided by their agencies to local CE programs. Of the 172 agencies reporting some kind of relationship to CE, 90, or 52%, reported that staff support was provided to local programs; 52% reported that support was provided in terms of materials; 35% reported that equipment was provided; another 35% that facilities were provided; and 29% indicated that funding was provided.

In summary, interagency cooperation was found to be the most developed element of all six state operational elements. Almost all SEAs (46) had interagency arrangements with one to three agencies while a slightly lower number of SEAs (38) had arrangements of the types presented above with four or more agencies.

In addition to the inquiry on interagency cooperation within states, the CE coordinators were also asked about how the federal office of CE was used in helping develop a state program. Besides the funding received, the most frequent responses were that the federal office was a valuable source of information and support, and that it provided training and technical assistance to the state and local program staffs. Summarizing the responses, it was found that the federal office was most often thought of as being a provider of information, materials, technical assistance and training, and as serving in a valuable support role.

Most CE coordinators reported that they received considerable support and assistance from the federal CE program in developing and implementing their state programs during 1979-80. Fifty-five percent of the coordinators reported considerable assistance; 33% reported occasional assistance; and 12% reported virtually no interaction with the federal community education program staff. Of those 42 coordinators reporting on the usefulness of these interactions, 52% said that their interactions with the federal staff were very useful while the remaining 20% said that the interactions were useful. It is extremely noteworthy that none of those 42 coordinators indicated that the interactions were not useful. These data can be compared with the 1978 study in which 14 SEA community education project directors (56% of those surveyed) indicated there was considerable interaction with the federal CEP.

How Do SEAs Evaluate and Report on CE Activities?

In comparison to interagency cooperation, the development of evaluation processes and monitoring and reporting systems in all 51 SEAs was found to be only moderate to fair. SEAs that reported using any form of an evaluation process (29 states) evaluated their program with one or more of these five strategies:

- Internal evaluations by SEA teams (19);
- Self-evaluations with observational techniques (17);
- Third-party evaluation with observational techniques (13);
- Self-evaluations with formal instrumentation (11); and
- Third-party evaluations with formal instrumentation (11).

Communication is important to any educational program. It is especially important to the community education program since interaction with cooperating state agencies and the development of SEA supportive policies are two important elements of a state wide CE system. Communication between the state CE program and local programs is also extremely important. The CE coordinators in 24 SEAs collected some information on local program activities and these were reported to the state CE office. Reporting systems were originated by the state CE office in

11 states, required by state legislation or policy in five states, and implemented by informal arrangement in the remaining nine states. In those states with no reporting system, a small number of states reported that a system will be developed in the future while others (9) indicated that no reporting system will be developed.

As shown in Chapter 3, all except three states with a reporting system in use received a CEDI score of 14 or above. Two of those three states received a 13 and the third received a score of 11. Therefore, it is clear that development of reporting systems has only occurred in states with highly developed community education systems, as indicated by the CEDI.

For the most part, the barriers which appear to inhibit the development of reporting systems included the independence of local districts, limited staff and resources, and state policy preventing the collection of information. Other barriers which existed were:

- Reluctance by local districts to provide information;
- Limited staffing/resources;
- State has no fundamental "clout" to require autonomous school districts to provide information;
- LEA variations in paperwork requirements;
- SEA policy reducing reporting;
- State CE office not authorized to gather information;
- Lack of understanding of CE concept; and
- Cost/lack of funds.

Suggestions for how these barriers might be overcome or removed will appear in Chapter 8.

*How Do State Commitment Elements
Interact With SEA Operational Elements?*

In examining interactions between state commitment elements and SEA operational elements, it was apparent that there were several important interactive relationships. For example, states with full-time CE coordinators were more likely to conduct formal or informal needs assessment (91% vs. 58%) and were more likely to have a statewide advisory council (82% vs. 35%) than were states without full-time coordinators. Similarly, states with full-time coordinators were more likely to develop relationships with state agencies in the areas of health (71% vs. 18%), human services/resources (82% vs. 41%), parks and recreation (79% vs. 59%), aging (82% vs. 47%), and community colleges (79% vs. 59%).

States with federal CE grants (financial resource base) in 1979-80 differed importantly from states without grants. States with federal grants were more likely to have a statewide advisory council (82% vs. 50%), and were more likely to have established relationships with state agencies in the areas of parks and recreation (85% vs. 58%), health (63% vs. 42%), aging (78% vs. 62%), and community colleges (78% vs. 67%). Interestingly, the presence of federal CE funds in FY80 was only mildly related (56% vs. 46%) to the presence of a state plan.

The pattern of relationships based on the number of years of federal funding was similar to that based on the presence or absence of a 1979-80 federal CE grant. States with three or more years of federal CE grants were more likely than states with two or less years to have statewide CE advisory councils (77% vs. 52%) and to have established relationships with state agencies in the areas of parks and recreation (80% vs. 62%), health (67% vs. 33%), aging (77% vs. 62%), and community colleges (80% vs. 62%). The number of years of federal CE funding was relatively unrelated to the presence or absence of a state plan (53% vs. 48%).

The pattern of these findings clearly indicates that the presence or absence of federal financial support influenced the level of operations of state CE offices. States with a history of federal grants had been more able to involve

members of the general public and other state agencies in statewide CE activities. This pattern ought to be viewed within the context that federal monies were a major source of funds for many state CE offices and, therefore, logically influenced their level (existence) of operations.

CHAPTER 6

DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL PROGRAMS

The ultimate purpose of state community education systems is to develop, support, and improve community education in local communities throughout the state. It is, therefore, assumed that all state commitment and SEA operational elements ought to facilitate such local development.

*How Effective Are SEAs
in Developing Local Programs?*

The six operational elements presented in Chapter 5 were examined on the one hand in terms of how they indirectly impacted on local CE development. On the other hand, the dissemination of information and the delivery of training and other technical assistance are designed to have direct, localized effects on communities, schools and community education programs.

The findings of this survey of SEA activity directed toward local programs centered around three basic areas: information dissemination, training/technical assistance (T/TA) and the actual existence of local programs. These three elements formed the third major component of the Community Education Development Index (CEDI). In that index, these three elements were organized into five separate items, each having an equal score of one on the CEDI. A summary of the presence of those elements in the 51 SEAs appears in Table 16.

Table 16

Presence of Local Development Elements in the States

Local Development Elements	States	
	Number	Percent*
Information Dissemination		
-- 1-4 strategies	49	96
-- 5 or more strategies	37	73
Training/Technical Assistance		
-- 1-5 content areas	44	86
-- 6 or more content areas	37	73
Local Programs Present in Communities	48	94

*Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple responses

Comparatively speaking, the states received higher scores for local development than for the other two components of the CEDI. These findings do not necessarily indicate the extent to which the SEAs were responsible for this development. It was more obviously the result of a variety of national-state-local partnerships. It is, however, important to note that the three states without local programs (48 states reported having local programs) did not provide T/TA, did not fund local programs, do not have a full-time CE coordinator, and do not have state policy support for their efforts. It should be pointed out that perhaps there are local programs but these states did not recognize them. However, on a national scale, the states have been highly successful in developing comprehensive strategies of information dissemination and T/TA. To some extent, this is not surprising because of the number of states receiving federal funds during the past four years. These activities/elements were particularly emphasized by the federal CEP.

Another indicator of the extent of local development and SEA activities locally directed is the distribution of subscores on the CEDI. Almost two-thirds (32) of the SEAs received a score of five on this subscale. Another ten SEAs received a score of four; therefore, almost 85% of the SEAs received a four or

five. This represents substantial development and success in the area of local community education development as indicated by these quantitative data (see Table 17).

Table 17
Distribution of CEDI Local Development Element Subscores

Score	States	
	Number	Percent
5	32	64
4	10	20
3	2	4
2	3	6
1	3	6
0	1	2
Total	51	100
Mean = 4.2		Median = 5

Just how successful these activities and services were rests in additional descriptive and qualitative data to be presented in the following sections of this chapter.

Who Are the Recipients of T/TA?

Approximately 17,671 individuals were reported by CE coordinators as having received T/TA during 1979-80. The types and numbers of recipients included in that total are presented in Table 18 on the following page.

Overall, the numbers varied considerably within states. Eighty-five percent of the recipients represented local communities in various ways. Almost 90% of the state advisory council members received some type of T/TA from the SEAs. It

Table 18

Local Recipients of SEA Provided Training/Technical Assistance (T/TA)

Type of Recipient	Number of Recipients
Community residents	5,222
Local school staff	4,435
Local CE staff	4,079
Cooperating agency staff	1,403
Local government leaders	1,241
State advisory council members	656
SEA staff	635
Total	17,671

is noteworthy that more than twice as many cooperating agency staff as other SEA staff were reported to have received T/TA. While the total numbers seem fairly high and the mean number of recipients per state was 393, the range was much higher with one state accounting for 1,640 recipients, almost 10% of the total number. Another state accounted for 23% of the 5,222 community residents. Thus, the extent of assistance, as measured by the number of recipients actually reported by the CE coordinators varied considerably across the states.

*How Comprehensive is the Training and
Technical Assistance Provided by the SEAs?*

In addition to the survey and analysis of the number and nature of the recipients of T/TA, the degree of comprehensiveness of the content of T/TA was examined. In conducting this survey a fairly comprehensive list of 14 content areas of T/TA was developed and presented to CE coordinators. They were asked to indicate whether, in fact, T/TA had been provided in each of the areas, as well as the means of delivery and their perception of the usefulness of such T/TA (see Table 19 below).

Table 19

Content Areas of Training/Technical Assistance

1. Developing Community Councils, Task Forces, Steering Committees
2. Identifying Funding Sources
3. Drafting Instruments for Needs Assessment
4. Writing Proposals for Funding CE Programs
5. Designing Programs for Special Populations
6. Developing Project Management Skills
7. Designing Programs Based on Community Needs Assessment
8. Developing Job Descriptions and Qualifications for CE Employees
9. Designing Public Relations or Advertising Materials
10. Designing and Drafting Instruments for Evaluations of CE Projects
11. Drafting School Board or Interagency Joint Resolutions
12. Developing Plans for Design or Use of School Facilities
13. Analyzing LEA or Local Government Policy or Regulations Relating to CE
14. Analysis of Data and Writing Reports on Evaluations of CE Projects

The content area of developing community councils, task forces, and steering committees was provided in 41 states in which T/TA of any kind was provided. Identifying funding sources for CE programs, drafting needs assessment instruments, and writing proposals also were common areas provided through T/TA. The only area in which T/TA was not provided in over 50% of the states was: analysis of data and writing reports on evaluations of CE projects. The lack of evaluative data on LEAs' efforts in CE is understandable in light of this finding. Thus, from a national perspective, the SEAs provided a highly comprehensive program of T/TA, as indicated by the following findings:

- 13 out of the 14 broad and varied content areas of T/TA were provided in over 50% of all states;
- 37 SEAs provided T/TA in six or more areas;
- 23 SEAs provided T/TA in ten or more areas; and
- 10 SEAs provided T/TA in 13 to 14 areas, and six SEAs provided T/TA in all 14 areas.

State coordinators were asked which types of recipients of T/TA had the greatest potential for contributing to the development of the state CE system. Results showed that coordinators felt that local CE staff and local school staff had the greatest potential for making contributions. State advisory council members were also thought of as having good potential. Community residents, local government leaders, SEA staff, and cooperating agency staff were rated low on this question. However, these state agencies did contribute to the development and provision of T/TA in the states.

A total of 738 training and technical assistance events were jointly sponsored by the state CE office and other agencies during the 1979-80 year. Local CE programs were the most frequent joint sponsor (249 events), followed by IHE Centers (172), cooperating state agencies (116), state CE associations (100), community colleges (71), and private non-profit agencies (30).

*What Means for Delivering T/TA
Have Been Most Effective?*

In terms of the means by which T/TA was provided, local recipients reported that they took part in more workshops than in personal face-to-face or telephone consultations. In order to determine the most useful strategy for training and technical assistance, the state coordinators and local program recipients in the national mail survey were all asked to rate the usefulness of each T/TA area in which they provided or received T/TA. Usefulness was rated in terms of very useful, useful, and not useful. Summary results over all 14 T/TA areas are shown in Table 20. In interpreting the data, the higher the mean, the more useful the strategy is rated (Not Useful = 1; Useful = 2; Very Useful = 3). The results show that, overall, local recipients (the receivers) rated the T/TA more useful than

the state coordinators (the providers). Interestingly, the local recipients felt that personal face-to-face consultations were more useful than telephone consultations or workshops. On the other hand, the state coordinators felt that training workshops were more useful than personal face-to-face and telephone consultations. The data also show that local and state CE staff who were involved with combinations of two or all three T/TA strategies rated the T/TA more useful than local and state coordinators who received or provided only face-to-face consultation alone, telephone consultation alone, or workshop training alone. Only one exception to this occurred and it may have been due to a low number of occurrences in the relevant category of this analysis.

Table 20
Usefulness of T/TA Strategies as Reported by Local Recipients

Means of T/TA	*Mean Rating of State Coordinators Whose Office Provided T/TA	*Mean Rating of Local Recipients Where Programs Have Received T/TA
Personal Face-to-Face	2.38	2.57
Telephone	2.10	2.33
Training Workshops	2.44	2.30
Face-to-Face and Telephone	2.37	2.68
Face-to-Face and Workshops	2.45	2.71
Telephone and Workshops	2.20	2.56
Face-to-Face, Telephone, and Workshops	2.69	2.76

*Ratings:

- 1 = Not Useful
- 2 = Useful
- 3 = Very Useful

It is also important to point out that local recipients rated telephone consultations more useful than did state coordinators who were the providers. The reason for this finding may be that impersonal telephone calls are not very satisfactory to T/TA providers; but if they provide important information to local program coordinators, they are useful to them and rated as such. It appears that the usefulness of information conveyed was slightly more important than the means used to deliver the assistance.

*How Do Local Development Elements Interact
With State Commitment Elements?*

Support to local programs is another indicator of state commitment for CE. This support is evidenced by the extent and quality of information dissemination, training and technical assistance provided by states to local programs.

The extent of information may be assessed by the number of states developing and using various types of materials as well as the number of states using various information dissemination strategies. Pamphlets and brochures were the materials most frequently developed by the states, 61% and 59% respectively. Manuals, training exercises, slide-tape presentations, films, filmstrips, and video-taped cassettes were each less frequently developed. Speeches and presentations at conferences and/or conventions were used by practically all (92%) of the states. Direct mail to interested individuals and groups, the preparation of monographs and booklets, and the distribution of films, slides, videotapes, etc. were strategies used by at least 75% of states. A direct relationship between the use of these strategies and local CE development was not determined.

The state CE coordinator was most frequently involved in disseminating information and providing training and technical assistance. Also, SEA personnel both within and outside of the CE program also provided T/TA in over half of the states. Thus, commitment in terms of information dissemination and the provision of training and technical assistance was fairly high. Again, its direct relationship to actual local CE developments was not evaluated or implied.

There were a number of factors which affected the amount of SEA assistance provided to local CE programs and the number of such local programs in existence. States with full-time coordinators, for example, had a greater number of local programs than states without full-time coordinators (means = 75.7 vs. 32.6), and states with full-time coordinators also had more federally-supported local programs (means = .9 vs. .4). States with full-time coordinators were more likely to provide T/TA to local program personnel (100% vs. 71%), and more frequently used each of the following to provide T/TA to local projects: CE coordinator (100% vs. 53%); other CE staff (79% vs. 24%); SEA (not CE) staff (68%

vs. 12%); IHE personnel (91% vs. 59%); paid outside trainers (56% vs. 12%); and the state CE association (71% vs. 24%). States with full-time coordinators were more likely to use each of the following information dissemination channels: Speeches at conferences and conventions (100% vs. 76%); booths at conferences and conventions (62% vs. 29%); direct mail (91% vs. 59%); articles in statewide journals (82% vs. 29%); CE office newsletters (68% vs. 29%); statewide media (television, radio, newspapers) (62% vs. 12%); films, slides, videotapes (85% vs. 53%); and monographs and booklets (85% vs. 65%). In the area of materials development, states with full-time coordinators were more likely to produce the following types of materials: Videotapes/cassettes (26% vs. 0%); manuals (47% vs. 12%); general handouts/pamphlets (47% vs. 6%); and brochures (71% vs. 35%).

There were also differences based on FY80 CE funding and years of federal funding. States with federal CE funding for FY80 were more likely than those without to provide T/TA to local programs (100% vs. 79%) and to use the National CE Clearinghouse to provide information to local programs (74% vs. 26%). Similarly, states with three or more years of federal CE funding were more likely than those with two or less years of funding to provide T/TA to local programs (100% vs. 76%) and to use the National CE Clearinghouse to provide information to local programs (83% vs. 29%). The presence of a full-time coordinator and federal financial support, thus, clearly increases the ability of state CE offices to provide assistance to local programs.

There was significant relationship between the existence of funding through state legislation for community education and the number of local programs in the state. The 11 states with such legislation accounted for exactly half of the 2,963 local programs reported. Whereas the mean number of local programs per state overall was 61, the mean number for those 11 states was 136, over twice as many as the overall mean.

PART C

NATIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER 7

FEDERAL STRATEGY

The federal entry into community education was made with relatively limited funding (approximately \$3.17 million per year) and limited program staff (never more than seven professionals). In order for the limited funding and staff time to have maximum national impact in the field, the federal program office devised a specific strategy. The strategy during the first four-year funding cycle focused on (1) state capacity-building, (2) national training initiatives, (3) local model-building, and (4) the interaction of the program office and the national Community Education Advisory Council with certain national governmental and non-governmental agencies/organizations. This evaluation, as designed, produced information about the first two strategy elements, but not the third and fourth.

In examining the broad issue of the federal strategy, several specific questions will be discussed in this chapter.

- How has the federal funding pattern affected the development of CE in the states?
- How do SEAs funded by the federal program differ from those states not funded and how do states funded for different lengths of time differ from each other?
- To what extent have federal training and technical assistance (1) been useful to SEAs, (2) demonstrated a viable federal T/TA role, and (3) addressed important SEA training needs?
- Is a federal-state-local partnership operating, and in what ways has/should the federal program enhance such a partnership?

- Is there a specific and effective national strategy evident in the interaction of the federal program and the joint and separate actions of the SEAs?
- What is the capacity of the states to effectively implement formula funding?

*How Has the Federal Funding Pattern
Affected the Development of CE in the States?*

There are clear indications that the federal program has, through both the prospect of and the delivery of funding, encouraged many states to make a commitment to community education. Of 38 SEAs visited in the study, two-thirds of them initiated CE programs during the federal funding period. The number of SEAs with designated CE coordinators increased from nine prior to federal funding to 51 during the study year. In 34 SEAs, the position was full-time, indicating that more than just token commitment was made.

Various operational elements became more common in the states, especially in those states with federal grants. For example, in the 1979-80 program year, states with federal grants were more likely to have statewide advisory councils than states without grants (82% vs. 50%) and were more likely to have established relationships with state agencies in such different areas as parks and recreation (85% vs. 58%) and health (63% vs. 42%). States with three or four years of federal funding were more likely to be more active in these areas than those with two years or less. Statewide needs assessments were reported in 41 of the 51 states. Of the ten states reporting no statewide needs assessment, all had had either no federal grants or only one year of funding support. The pattern of the evaluation findings clearly indicates that the presence of federal financial support has influenced the level of operations of state CE offices. This is not surprising because of the required/mandated goals associated with federal funding for SEAs.

With regard to training and technical assistance to local communities, the study shows that SEAs with federal grants in FY80 were more likely to provide such assistance than those without grants (100% vs. 79%). It is clear that the statewide capacity for T/TA assistance to locals has been dramatically

increased in a significant number of states by the federal efforts to support SEA program development. Given the history described in Chapter 1, it is highly unlikely that these increased capacities and levels of state operations would have occurred in any similar four-year period without the support of the federal program and funding. Although hard data were not sought in this study to document the effects of the federal program in its non-funding impacts, there is reason to observe that the national visibility through information disseminated by the federal CEP to all 51 SEAs, the national training workshops conducted for CE coordinators (the participation of the non-funded coordinators in these quarterly sessions was supported financially by the CEP), and possibility of future funding associated with the federal program may have encouraged many states to embark upon CE development processes for which no federal funding was directly responsible.

In general, the effect of the federal program (particularly in funding CE coordinators' positions) in generating CE activity in the various states seems to have exceeded what would normally be expected from the state capacity-building monies involved.

How Do SEAs Funded by the Federal Program Differ from Those States Not Funded and How Do States Funded for Different Lengths of Time Differ from Each Other?

As presented in the previous chapter, funded states have been more likely to provide T/TA to local communities and to have more extensive operations in terms of state advisory councils (citizen participation) and interagency cooperation at the state level. Also, states with two years or more of funding have exceeded those with only one in the aforementioned developmental areas.

The Community Education Development Index (CEDI) presents an overall picture of the differences in the funding patterns. States which have been funded for two or more years as a group have a mean score in excess of 14.0; states with one year of funding have a group mean of 8.7; and non-funded states have a group mean of 7.9. Interestingly, states grouped in two, three, and four-year funding categories showed a group index mean of less than 1.0 from one another, with

states funded for two years having the highest group mean at 14.8. From this evidence, it can be concluded that for purposes of encouraging and supporting comprehensive development of state program elements, a policy of funding SEAs for at least two consecutive years should be established.

The benefits of federal funding to the states in three- and four-year funding patterns appeared to be in the development of better quality or more extensive activity within specific program components. For example, the length of the funding patterns does seem to affect the variety and extent of T/TA services offered to local communities. All states funded for four years and 94% of the states funded for three years offered T/TA in six or more content areas, while only two-thirds of the states with two years of federal funding offered T/TA in more than six content areas.

It is important to note that conclusions about the relationship of federal funding patterns to SEA development should take into consideration the federal funding process. The competitive grant making process has tended to result in the funding of states with the greater proposal writing skills, existing resources for development, and community education initiatives already in place. The study shows that smaller states with fewer resources were less likely to receive federal grants. Consequently, there is a limit to what can be claimed as federal funding impacts in the "highly developed" states, and there is little evidence upon which to draw conclusions about the potential impact of federal funding in "less developed or developing" states.

Still, the evidence appears sufficient to conclude that relatively small grants (\$30,000-\$40,000) have made significant impacts upon SEA program development and that multi-year funding produces significantly more developmental impact than one-year of funding.

*To What Extent Have Federal Training and Technical Assistance
(1) Been Useful to SEAs, (2) Demonstrated a Viable Federal
T/TA Role, and (3) Addressed Important SEA Training Needs?*

Federal program training for SEAs was provided through a national training grant to Ball State University on a competitive proposal basis. Technical assistance, largely informational in nature, was provided through the normal communication channels between federal and state offices and to some extent through direct federal office staff involvement in national training events. Both funded and non-funded SEAs were offered training as a feature of the IHE grant.

The federal program was cited by the SEAs as the single most common source of training, with 45 of the 51 states participating at least once. With regard to "support and assistance" (technical assistance) from the federal CEP office, 28 SEAs saw themselves as receiving "considerable support," 17 "occasional support," and six "none." Of 42 responding SEAs, 22 rated their interaction with the federal program as "very useful" and the other 20 as "useful." None felt that it was not useful.

Many SEAs indicated that they had used the training they received to provide local communities with specific T/TA in a wide range of content areas (evaluation, needs assessment, planning, interagency cooperation, advisory councils, citizen participation, etc.). Many also indicated that the training they had received had resulted in new state-level SEA activities (interagency cooperation, K-12 integration, state plan development, state network development, etc.). The study did not differentiate between applications of training from the federal program and those from other training experiences. However, as the most common source of training and as an element in a federal-state interaction rated as strongly useful, the federal training can be regarded as generally having been effective in addressing SEA needs and impacting on their state programs and services to local CE programs.

The viability of a federal role in SEA training appears to be confirmed. The existence of the funding necessary to conduct SEA training on a national basis and the national facilitative role of the federal program give it an impact

potential shared by few other training sources. That 18 of the 24 non-funded SEAs in 1979-80 participated actively in training demonstrates that its viability as a training source goes beyond its ability to motivate training participation through its grants to individual states. As previously mentioned, the federal CEP has provided travel expenses for non-funded SEAs interested in participating in their sponsored training events. This can be viewed as an additional service to SEAs.

*Is a Federal-State-Local Partnership
Operating, and in What Ways Has/Should the
Federal Program Enhance Such a Partnership?*

In the sense that the federal program has influenced the development of state programs, which in turn have impacted in an ad hoc manner upon local programs, there is a kind of "informal partnership" constructed on a mutual benefits basis. However, there is no evidence of any structured partnership strategy at the federal level. In fact, evidence exists (though it was not formally collected as part of the study) that SEA and LEA recipients of CEP grants in some states do not mutually support each other, or even interact, despite the fact that they might be regarded as partners in the same general federal strategy. The federal program appears to work with SEAs and LEAs as separate groups in most respects, although the federal staff has verbally encouraged SEA and LEA grantees in the same state to communicate and cooperate. Where there is little or no direct "partnership" interaction among grantees in a particular state, the state program loses a valuable opportunity to use a local model for demonstration purposes, and the local program loses valuable developmental support and service from the SEA.

*Is There a Specific and Effective National
Strategy Evident in the Interaction
of the Federal Program and the
Joint and Separate Actions of the SEAs?*

In the SEA training and the distribution of SEA and LEA grants, it can be said that the federal program has touched every state in the nation at some time during the four years, although the impact of that interaction has varied greatly from state to state. There was by no means a uniform understanding of and response to the federal program and its strategy across all states. On the other hand, the

formation of an organization of SEAs (the National Council of State Education Agency Community Educators) as an outgrowth of federal program activity indicates that some impact has been made by the federal program. Also, that a substantial number of federally-funded states was widely distributed geographically suggests that the federal program has had national implications. This also suggests that the groundwork has been created for even broader and more effective national development. Whether the broader, more effective national development materializes through federal program efforts may depend upon several future outcomes. Among them are:

- The extent to which local model products are disseminated and used;
- The extent to which the less successful states (as identified by the CEDI) "are turned on and tune in" as a result of federal program efforts;
- The extent to which the SEAs become working partners with other state-level agencies, institutions, and organizations in state capacity-building in all states; and
- The extent to which federal program grantees and non-grantees (SEAs, IHEs, LEAs and non-profits) form effective working partnerships within their respective states to maximize the impact and cost effectiveness of federal funding.

*What is the Capacity of the States
to Effectively Implement Formula Funding?*

Since the 1978 legislation includes a provision for formula funding, the anticipated effectiveness of such a major federally-funded program element is an important issue. Using existing program elements as a kind of barometer, the study showed that 34 states had a full-time coordinator (or more than part-time staff), 22 states have had past experience in state-level CE funding, 24 states had reporting systems in place for monitoring local programs, and 26 had state plans drafted or approved for CE development. Some 49 SEAs had information dissemination strategies in place, 37 of which were using five or more dissemination techniques. Such evidence suggests that as many as half of the SEAs may be in a questionable readiness condition for formula funding in CE.

While it is possible for an SEA to develop a formula funding structure when funds actually become available for that purpose, there are at least two issues to be considered in connection with such delayed capacity-building: The question of the potential for ineffectiveness in a hastily-constructed structure and the question of the degree to which formula funding, particularly in contingency situations, will divert SEA staff time and other resources from important LEA training, LEA technical assistance, and state network-building roles. The present general state of readiness across the nation suggests that in many states these operational elements may very well be adversely affected, depending on the willingness of SEAs to contribute the extra resources and staff time needed to preclude such an outcome.

70

CHAPTER 8

NATIONAL MONITORING AND REPORTING

A major finding of the first national evaluation of the Community Education Program conducted in 1978, (that study surveyed SEAs and LEAs funded by the federal CEP both in 1976 and refunded in 1977) was that information, data and monitoring systems designed to generate information on local CE programs at the state level was almost non-existent. The Final Report of that evaluation stated:

Only five (21%) of the 26 projects indicated they had actual counts of the number of people who attended project sponsored conferences and only 4 (17%) had figures for those attending workshops; the other projects provided either "close approximations" or "rough estimates" when asked for information in these areas. Information on the type of participants at project sponsored events was even less precise. It should be noted that the projects had not been requested to keep and report such information to the Office of Education. Also, some project directors commented that they had some quantitative information in other reporting categories and that the Community Education Program should provide a standard set of definitions for reporting purposes.^{1/}

As a result of that finding and the expanded role of SEAs in the national strategy for CE development, the national Community Education Advisory Council set as an objective for this 1980 national evaluation to examine the status of monitoring and reporting in CE and begin to develop and test a reporting system.

The topic of monitoring and reporting will be examined in this final chapter of Part C by addressing the following questions:

- What types and levels of information would be useful at the local, state and national levels?
- How can SEAs overcome certain barriers to gathering information at the local levels?

^{1/}An Evaluation of the Community Education Program, The Final Report. (Prepared by Development Associates, Inc.), Washington, D.C. GPO: 1978, p. 55.

The findings and information presented in response to these questions were taken from interviews conducted with state CE coordinators, other SEA staff, and cooperating agency representatives in the 38 states visited in this study, as well as from the survey of the 37 LEAs with a federal grant in the 1979-80 program year.

*What Types and Levels of Information
Would Be Useful at the Local,
State and National Levels?*

Several basic assumptions should be considered in the development of a national reporting and information system:

- Information from local programs and activities is the foundation of a national reporting system;
- The informational needs of a local CE program should be considered in developing a reporting process;
- Not all of the information maintained and collected locally would be useful at the state level, within the SEA in particular;
- The informational needs of local, state and national CE programs vary;
- Information dissemination (with various objectives) is enhanced by the availability of systematic data and information on local and state activities; and
- Systematic data and information on local and state activities are necessary to determine impact of a solid, comparative nature.

In this study, a local reporting form which was originally designed by Development Associates as part of an earlier contract with the federal CEP was used to gather information from LEAs and used as a point of departure for this component of the study. That form -- the Local Monitoring Data Procedure Form (LMDP) -- had been field tested for readability and usability as part of its earlier design process. The form was revised slightly to facilitate completion and coding and was completed by the 37 LEA projects with a federal CE grant in

72

1979-80. There were three primary objectives for this form being completed by the LEAS: (1) To test the overall use of the form in a manageable number of local programs; (2) to further examine the procedural aspects of the form, that is, how difficult was the form to complete; and (3) to use the form to describe the LEAs in relation to the federal strategy (refer to Chapter 7 in Volume II, The Technical Report, for a detailed presentation and analysis of the form and data).

The levels or categories of information most useful to those 37 local CE programs were identified and appear in Table 21, along with informational needs for the local, state and federal levels. The ten major categories of information are: School facilities use; policy support for CE; funding for local programs; program processes; staffing deployment and development; program boards and councils; interagency cooperation; program activities and participants; community problems and issues; and program effects. The recommended levels of use were based on analyses of local CE program staff reviews of the LMDP form, and interviews with state CE coordinators and federal CEP staff.

A basic assumption is that all information in all ten categories would be collected from local CE programs but not all information would be useful to the local program. For instance, information about local policy support for CE, while it is programmatically important to a local program, would be most useful at the state and federal level in setting resource and funding goals. A number of categories of information would be useful to all three levels. For example, under school facilities use the number of school and non-school facilities used would be useful to local, state and federal community education staff and related school and program leadership. Moreover, information from needs assessments, interagency cooperation, community problems and program effects ought to be useful to all three levels.

Table 21
Levels of Information for Reporting

Information Categories	Recommended Use By:		
	Local Programs	State Programs	Federal Programs
1. School Facilities Use			
• Number of buildings and school districts in community	x	x	x
• Number of school buildings used for CE	x	x	x
• Non-school buildings used for CE	x	x	x
• Program purposes for building usage	x	x	
• Time facilities are used	x	x	
2. Policy Support for CE			
• School boards		x	x
• Local governments		x	x
3. Funding for Local Programs			
• Cash	x	x	
• Equivalent contributions	x	x	
4. Program Processes			
• Needs assessments	x	x	x
• Resource assessments	x	x	
• Program evaluations	x	x	
5. Staffing Deployment and Development			
• Paid staff	x	x	
• Volunteers	x	x	
• Number with academic degree in CE	x	x	
• In-service training	x	x	
6. Program Boards and Councils			
• Number of boards		x	x
• Number of members by type and representation		x	
• Responsibilities		x	
7. Interagency Cooperation			
• Type and number of agency	x	x	x
• Nature of arrangements	x	x	
8. Program Activities and Participants			
• Number and type of courses	x	x	
• Services offered	x	x	
• Participants by age groups	x	x	
9. Community Problems and Issues	x	x	x
10. Program Effects	x	x	x

*How Can SEAs Overcome Certain Barriers
to Gathering Information at the Local Level?*

A variety of barriers to collecting information by the SEAs were presented in Chapter 5. These barriers might be overcome by defining a clear relationship between the state and local CE programs in which information requirements are explained and a trusting relationship is developed. Simple forms and instrumentation collecting only essential information should be used in overcoming the resistance of local CE programs. Various suggestions were given by state CE coordinators for overcoming barriers to statewide reporting systems. Some of them were:

- Explain why information is important;
- Simplify forms;
- Provide more funds/staff;
- Distribute funds to gain fiscal clout;
- Grant SEAs authority to collect information;
- Have local staff design data collection and reporting systems;
- Ask only essential questions; and
- Develop trust between SEA and LEA staffs.

These suggestions should be used as a basis for initiating further discussions with LEAs and SEAs about strategies for developing systematic data gathering, reporting and monitoring systems for their programs.

PART D

COMMUNITY EDUCATION:
RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

CHAPTER 9

RETROSPECT: RESULTS OF FOUR YEARS OF FEDERAL FUNDING

A. INTRODUCTION: 1978 EVALUATION

When the initial federal grants were made in July 1976, slightly over half (15) of the SEAs surveyed had a state office of community education, but most (16) did not have a state plan or policy statement and only seven of the refunded states had community education legislation. A year and a half later (January 1978), 25% of those without a plan or policy had one written and adopted, and another 25% had one written but not yet approved. In addition, in one of the states with a newly approved state policy there was also new state legislation and in a second there was a line item for community education in the state budget. In another state, one with neither officially adopted plans or policy, community education legislation was pending. In all nine of these states (i.e., in one-third of the refunded projects), the project directors reported that these changes in the state policy context were almost entirely attributable to staff and activities supported through the federal program.*

This brief summary of the 1978 survey of 27 SEAs, which had been funded in 1976 and refunded in 1977, provides a general overview of the status of community education development in the SEAs after one and a half years of federal funding and support for community education.

B. 1980 STATUS

Now after four full years of federal funding, 45 states have a designated CE office with a CE contact person or part-time staff person assigned some responsibility for community education.

*An Evaluation of the Community Education Program, The Final Report, (Prepared by Development Associates, Inc.), Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1978, p. 29.

In 1980, there were 26 states with state plans written, but only eight of those were officially approved. Moreover, 38 states (75% of total) had a state board resolution or state legislation supporting community education. In addition to resolutions and legislation, SEAs in 35 states (in 1980) provided funding for state CE office activities, and 22 states provided funding for local programs.

It appears that significant development and change in the state policy context, in SEA operational practices and in activities relating directly toward local community education have occurred over the four years 1976-1980. Furthermore, these developments and changes are attributable to the support provided by the federal CEP. There is conclusive evidence that the federal program has speeded up the development of state programs. In a significant number of states, the rate of development far exceeded that which might have been expected in any similar four-year period, particularly since most states did not have a state-level CE program at the beginning of that period.

C. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The broad range of findings and analyses presented here and in the Technical Report (Volume II) support the conclusion that the federal legislative mandate was met, and that the states have been quite successful in developing state community education systems capable of expanding and supporting community education programs. These detailed findings and descriptions will not be repeated in these closing chapters. A number of major concluding observations which reinforce those conclusions, however, will be presented.

- The Eight Minimum Elements as published and promoted by the federal program received wide national acceptance as basic local program criteria or elements, despite the fact that not all local programs (nor even all federally-funded LEA projects) addressed all of them. The elements appeared to have filled a need for basic guidelines or standards during this period of change and flux in the development of the community education concept.

- State needs assessments and interagency cooperation were the strongest "operational elements" in the SEA CE programs. Forty-one SEAs had completed CE needs assessments and 46 had cooperative relationships with other state-level agencies. More than 90% of the leaders in 172 state agencies in the study felt that such relationships with the SEA CE program had been useful.
- State planning, evaluating, and reporting (and, to a lesser extent, citizen participation at the state level) were the weakest operational elements of SEA CE systems, when measured in terms of the extent of development of those elements. With the exception of citizen participation, as defined by the existence of state advisory councils, no more than half of the 51 SEAs had these operational elements in place. Moreover, fewer than half (24) of the states had a process for collecting comprehensive information (reporting) on local CE programs in their states. This is a serious basic deficiency in their capacity for statewide conceptualizing, planning administering assistance to LEAs (including formula funding) and performing other state leadership functions.
- Absent or incomplete comprehensive state plans for CE development was a significant deficiency in the states. Nearly half of the states had made little or no progress with state plans, despite their potential importance to comprehensive state capacity-building, the efficient delivering of assistance to local programs, and the possible administering of formula funding. Only eight SEAs had state plans completed and approved by state boards or superintendents; 18 others were in the draft stage. The federal CEP had limited influence in determining whether SEAs developed comprehensive working plans for state development (and, in turn, whether those plans are systematically carried out). The leaders in the state education agencies, both CE coordinators and their superiors, need to recognize their importance to effective statewide development if quality state plans are to become a national norm.
- Two-thirds of the states still have important "commitment" gains to be made. Only 12 states have both a board of education resolution and an SEA position paper on community education; 16 states have neither. Only 50% of the states have state legislation of any kind in support of CE. Only 50% of the states contribute state dollars to maintain the state CE coordinator's position.
- SEAs with full-time coordinators were more likely to have comprehensive/ extensive state-level operations than those with only part-time coordinators.
- SEA community education programs with federal grants were more likely than SEAs without federal grants to have citizen participation at the state level (state advisory councils) and to develop relationships with such important agencies as parks and recreation, health, aging, and community colleges.

- In developing strategies for information dissemination and T/TA, states have been highly successful in an overall sense. More than 17,000 individuals received T/TA in 1979-80, 85% being from local communities. According to the national survey of such local recipients, the state training programs were highly useful.

From a slightly different perspective, it is also possible to conclude that the federal CEP effectively implemented its national strategy and served the SEAs and LEAs in a productive manner. More specifically:

- The federal training program for SEAs conducted by IHEs reached about 45 states, non-funded as well as funded. The evidence indicates that most SEAs found the training useful and in turn incorporated training techniques and results directly into their work with local program representatives. In assessing this training, state CE coordinators appeared to value technical skill development areas more than conceptual development.
- The Community Education Development Index (CEDI), which identified common elements of state community education systems, was found to be very useful in isolating factors which appeared to contribute to the development of state community education systems. The index facilitated the identification of a group of ten "significantly less well developed" SEA programs (states with 9 points or less on the CEDI) which, in general, have not received federal funding and support comparable to the other states. Some of these states did not seek federal aid; others lacked the sophistication to compete successfully for federal dollars. These ten states represent a fundamental weakness in the development of CE as a national concept and presence.
- At least two consecutive years of federal funding appears to be the most effective cost/benefit pattern for SEAs. As shown in Chapter 7, states with two years of federal funding had a mean CEDI score in excess of 14.0, almost twice the mean score of states with one grant or no federal funding for community education. Moreover, additional years (three and four) did not increase the group mean score on the CEDI.

Overall, the variety of findings and analyses included in both volumes of this Final Report of the Evaluation of the Community Education Program suggest that the SEAs, on a national scale, have been successful in developing state-level capacity for developing state systems of community education.

CHAPTER 10

PROSPECT: OBSERVATIONS ABOUT FUTURE COMMUNITY EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

It seems appropriate to conclude The Policy Report with some general observations about prospects for future development of community education, on the national level, as well as about prospects for further evaluation and study. These observations are intended to stimulate future thought and discussion rather than to recommend specific or formal actions. As stated in the beginning of this report, Chapter 3-6 were organized around a series of important questions, some of which led to conclusions and suggestions for the future. It seems inappropriate here, therefore, to reiterate those findings.

First, there is an apparent discrepancy between the community education concept as described in Chapter 1, the intent of the federal legislative definition of a program, and community education practice in the important area of citizen participation. Whereas community education theory stresses the use of alternative citizen participation strategies, LEAs and particularly SEAs appear to limit their approaches to advisory councils. This formal method of citizen-participation, while a legitimate participatory technique, may preclude the active involvement of individuals interested in other types of commitments. Community education may very well develop in proportion to the number of alternative opportunities for participation made available to people at the local and state levels.

Second, even after four years, the need continues for systematic and common data and for information on community education local programs aggregated at the state and national levels. Such orderly information could be used to substantiate current financial expenditures as well as provide a rationale for future resources and policy development. Yet, very few community educators appear to use a reporting system to gather relevant data about their efforts. Present financial constraints confronting human service programs may eventually

require community education personnel and leaders to develop and use such reporting systems. The exchange of information between key local, state and national community education organizations would, therefore, be enhanced.

Third, the contributions of IHEs, state CE associations, private foundations, and other similar groups to "state capacity-building" were not dealt with in this study, but they do need to be considered in any future realistic assessment of a state's real capacity for successful performance. If state capacity-building is to continue as a federal program strategy, configurations of SEA-IHE-state association interaction need to be examined, evaluated, modeled, included in federal program published products, and possibly considered as criteria or focuses for federal funding.

Similarly, at the national level there appears to be a sense of fragmented leadership and strategizing. The federal CE program, the National Community Education Association, the National Council of State Education Agency Community Educators, the C.S. Mott Foundation, and other national groups have their own particular leadership functions to perform. However, an efficient and effective "national strategy" would seem to require that collaborative relationships be established and conceptual elements agreed upon so that the full force of several or all of the leadership groups could be mobilized and brought to bear upon the development of community education in the states and their respective communities. The national Community Education Advisory Council would appear to be a logical negotiator and convenor for such a purpose. A "national community education strategy task force," sanctioned by the various groups, might be an appropriate mechanism for beginning this effort.

In somewhat different and more focused terms, the various findings and analyses presented in this report lead to a number of important considerations for the future. More specifically, these findings and conclusions lead to the suggestions:

- That the federal program consider a strategy for encouraging and assisting "underdeveloped" states (as measured by the CEDI), including grants for two years for the creation of program elements identified as necessary to the development of community education capacity.

- That the federal program continue some form of national training for SEAs. Possibly at this stage, there should be a special content focus developed in-depth each year consistent with whatever major thrust would be most productive for national strategy purposes.
- That the federal program consider a "state team" format for training to include SEA, IHE, and local CE coordinators, who are located in the same state, thus building a federal-state-local partnership.
- That the "LEA Model" dissemination procedure include a process for monitoring usage by SEAs and replication by other communities.
- That formula funding to states be accompanied by a federal program analysis and position paper recommending that state capacity-building not be compromised by formula funding efforts, and that an evaluation be conducted after one year to measure the efforts of formula funding on other state development efforts.
- That the federal program consider limiting the number of years that an SEA may be awarded general program development/staffing grants.
- That the federal program further develop the CEDI and additional criteria for measuring the quality of state program elements as a basis for evaluating and supporting the development of "quality improvement."
- That the federal strategy be more clearly defined and information disseminated in terms of what "state capacity" is and how the state and federal programs can best cooperate in its proper development.
- That a national reporting system be developed which has as its foundation the Local Monitoring Data Procedure Form developed for and tested in this national study.
- That future policy development and evaluation efforts in community education focus upon some of the preceding suggestions as well as:
 - the identification of alternative causal models of state community education development;
 - the development of a cost-benefit analysis technique designed to assist local community education programs in estimating and reporting the financial benefits of programs; and
 - examination of the impacts of community education programs upon local communities and their citizens.

While many of the observations presented in this chapter are not necessarily new, the evidence of the past four years offers the potential for further community education development at the local, state and national levels. Indeed, the success of the federal Community Education Program depends upon a strong partnership with state and local community education programs.